

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/882,203	06/15/2001	Leonard R. Bayer	HAR-003	8016
75	590 03/20/2003			
Kenneth J. LuKacher			EXAMINER	
South Winton Court 3136 Winton Road South, Suite 304 Rochester, NY 14623			MCALLISTER, STEVEN B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3627	
			DATE MAILED: 03/20/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No. Applicant(s) 09/882,203

Bayer et al			
it		MI	
8627	1 1884B	1811	

## Office Action Summary

Art Unit Examiner Steven McAllister 3627

The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	s on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
Period for Reply	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SE	T TO EXPIRE MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a).	In an event however may a rank ha timple filed after SIV /GL MONTHS from the
mailing date of this communication.	in no event, however, may a reply be timely filed arter SIX (b) MORTHS from the
<ul> <li>If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within</li> <li>If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply</li> </ul>	
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date o	the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	This constitutionation, even it tartely mod, may reduce any
Status	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 8, 2	
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☒ This action is <b>FINAL</b> .	ction is non-final.
	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under $Ex p$	Parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims	is love popular in the application
	is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s)	is/are rejected.
7)  Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
8) X Claims 1-15 and 17-39	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Application Papers	
9) $\square$ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/ai	re a) $\square$ accepted or b) $\square$ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) $\square$ approved b) $\square$ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply	y to this Office action.
12) $\square$ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1	niner.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	
13) $\square$ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) □ All b) □ Some* c) □ None of:	
1.   Certified copies of the priority documents ha	ave been received.
2.   Certified copies of the priority documents ha	ive been received in Application No
<ol> <li>Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bur</li> </ol>	documents have been received in this National Stage eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of t	he certified copies not received.
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domesti	·
a) U The translation of the foreign language provision	
15) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domesti	c priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.
Attachment(s)	41
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Profferences's Potent Drawing Review (PTO 049)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  6) Other:
	o, ono

Art Unit: 2167

## **DETAILED ACTION**

It is noted that in the telephone conversation with Kenneth J. LuKacher on 9/24/02, a provisional election of claims 1-15 and 17-19 was made. This election was agreed to by the examiner since the applicant argued that claims 1-7 and claims 17-19 were not patentably distinct over claims 8-15. Claims 1-7 and 17-19 were rejected as obvious over the invention of claims 8-15 based on the previous conversation. Applicant's arguments regarding the claims (for instance claims 17-19) however, rely at least partly on elements of those claims which provide a basis for distinctness between the groups, for instance recording changes in each of selected features and subfeatures until a product is configured (p. 9, 4th full paragaph). In light of the argument that such features make the claims allowable (and therefore patentably distinct), a restriction requirement is set forth below.

Further, it is noted that the Group IV below, drawn to a web site, is patentably distinct from the groups originally presented in the case which have been previously examined on the merits. An election of Group IV would therefore be shift of invention.

## Election/Restriction

- Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121: 1.
  - I. Claims 1-7 and 17-19, drawn to a system for product research, classified in class 705, subclass 8.

Application/Control Number: 09/882,203 Page 3

Art Unit: 2167

II. Claims 8-12, drawn to a method and software for configuring a product, classified in class 705, subclass 10.

- III. Claims 13-15, drawn to software for configuring a product, classified in class 705, subclass 10.
  - IV. Claims 20-24 and 30-39, drawn to a web site, classified in class 707, subclass 10.
  - V. Claims 25-29, drawn to a method for a method of product configuration, classified in class 705, subclass 27.
- 2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: Inventions II and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the method can be practiced over the internet with a system which has the configuration software on the server.
- 3. Inventions I and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention III has separate utility such as software for performing product configuration on a standalone computer. See MPEP § 806.05(d).
- 4. Inventions I and IV are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be

Art Unit: 2167

separately usable. In the instant case, invention I has separate utility such as a networked computer system independent of market research. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

- 5. Inventions V and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus can be used to transfer data of any sort of the network.
- 6. Inventions II and III are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the software can be used to practice a materially different process wherein product configuration is accomplished at a non-networked computer and all information is kept in the computer.
- 7. Inventions II and IV are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process can be practiced using a locally networked system without a website.
- 8. Inventions V and I are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require

Art Unit: 2167

the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed since those particulars are not recited in the claim. The subcombination has separate utility such as a method for product configuration wherein software is not required to be downloaded to the computer, but is kept on the server.

- 9. Inventions III and IV are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention III has separate utility such as a standalone product configuration system. See MPEP § 806.05(d).
- 10. Inventions V and III are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the software can be used to practice a materially different process wherein the product configuration is accomplished at a single computer independent of a network.
- 11. Inventions V and IV are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice

Art Unit: 2167

another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the website is capable

of sending any unrelated information or software.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a 12.

separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination

purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a 13.

separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for

examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an 14.

election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37)

CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the 15.

inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently

named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any

amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the

fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 2167

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven B. McAllister whose telephone number is (703) 308-7052.

Steven B. McAllister

March 19, 2003